

Application No. 09/674,547

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner's attention to the present application is noted with appreciation.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action dated June 3, 2003, the Examiner rejected claims 1 through 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,085,793 to Burns et al. ("Burns"). Amended claim 1 recites "a coolant which is pre-diluted and does not require use of any additional water which provides effective metal corrosion inhibition and retains efficient mechanical seal function, comprising as its base component a member selected from the group consisting of deionized water having a specific resistance of $10 \times 10^4 \Omega \text{ cm}$ or higher with corrosive ions and scale forming ions having been removed, ethylene glycol aqueous solution prepared using such deionized water (between approximately 15 and 50 percent by weight ethylene glycol), and propylene glycol aqueous solution prepared using such deionized water, and wherein said pre-diluted coolant comprises between approximately 50 and 85 percent by weight said deionized water. Burns teaches an "after" dilution of the corrosion inhibitors which require 10-90% water after their original composition. In addition, Burns does not teach which corrosion inhibitors to include or exclude. The post dilution addition of water makes an entirely different composition. In addition, applicant's invention is an environmentally friendly coolant, and reducing metal corrosion inhibition agents and scale forming inhibition agents, thereby preventing pollution through the "pre-dilution". As discussed above, Burns neither recognizes nor suggests these net benefits. In direct contrast, Burns teaches an embodiment where the target substrate is high lead solder. Therefore, one with ordinary skill in the art would not recognize or suggest the net benefit of a "pre-diluted" coolant in the teaching of Burns.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all grounds of rejection and objection have been avoided and/or traversed. It is believed that the case is now in condition for allowance and same is respectfully requested.